





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,347	11/17/1999	HAROLD RAND THOMPSON	00216-468001	5709
7:	590 01/15/2002			
WILLIAM E BOOTH			EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHA 225 FRANKLI	N STREET		KAUFMAN, JOSEPH A	JOSEPH A
BOSTON, MA 021102804			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3754	<u> </u>
			DATE MAILED: 01/15/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.

09/442,347

Applicant(s)

Thompson et al.

Office Action Summary Examiner

Joseph A. Kaufman

∛ Unit 3754



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
	for Reply	
THE N	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
afi - If the	ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic	R 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed ation. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
- If NO co - Failur - Any i	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory permunication. The to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status		
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Dec 4, 20</u>	01
2a) 🗆	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This act	
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance a closed in accordance with the practice under $Ex\ pa$	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is rte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 C.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) 1-20 and 23-36	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s) <u>3, 4, 6-9, 18-20, 23, and</u>	27-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 💢	Claim(s) 2	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1, 5, 10-17, and 24-26	is/are rejected.
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers	
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	objected to by the Examiner.
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b,⊮ disapproved.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	iner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
-	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
a) 🗆	☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:	
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have	
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents hav	•
	 Copies of the certified copies of the priority d application from the International Bure ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th 	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
·		
Attachm		18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
_	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:
٠٠ ـــــ ٠٠	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/442,347

Art Unit: 3754

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 10-17 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 10 and 11, lines 1 and 2, the product delivery member and the product holding structure have been previously set forth, raising issues of double inclusion.

In claims 12-16, the various structures now in claim 2 are positively recited for a second time in each of these claims, i.e. "a porous structure". This raises issues of double inclusion.

Claims 17 and 24-26 depend from non-elected claims.

Please check all claims for similar deficiencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the inversion was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to

Application/Control Number: 09/442,347 Page 3

Art Unit: 3754

the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 5, 17, and 24sub1-26sub1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin in view of Frutin '054.

Baldwin shows a container 2; top 8; body portion 4; bottom 6; valve mechanism 15, 32; actuation lever/hand engaging portion 92; smooth connection 84; product delivery member 32; product holding structure as the flat rim below 8; valve actuating member 79; and the container can dispense spray of "any nature" as discussed in column 2, line 3. Baldwin lacks the axial discharge. Frutin shows the axial discharge in Figure 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the axial discharge as taught by Frutin on the device of Baldwin in order to have a different direction of flow out of the device which would better apply the material in certain situations.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claim 2 is allowed.
- 5. Claims 10-16 and 24sub2-36sub2 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

47 Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/442,347

Art Unit: 3754

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 21, 2001 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Frutin and Baldwin are not properly combinable. As both are aerosol containers that discharge liquid by using a gas propellant, they are clearly within the same field of endeavor. Further, merely changing the direction of discharge is common and Frutin was employed as an example of this concept.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph A. Kaufman whose telephone number is (703) 308-0266. On alternating Mondays and every Tuesday through Friday, Mr. Kaufman can be reached between the hours of 5:30AM and 3PM.

Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Group 3700 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 3700 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal

Plaza Building 2, Arlington, Virginia. The submission of such papers by facsimile transmission

Art Unit: 3754

must comply with the Notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CP-2 Fax Center number is (703) 305-3588.

jak

January 10, 2002

Primary Examiner

Group 3700